arXiv:1611.07087v1 [math.CO] 21 Nov 2016

Connectivity in Hypergraphs

Megan Dewar*, David Pike† and John Proos‡

November 23, 2016

Abstract

In this paper we introduce two natural notions of vertex connectivity for hypergraphs: weak and strong. We prove that the strong vertex connectivity of a connected hypergraph is bounded by its weak edge connectivity, thereby extending a theorem of Whitney from graphs to hypergraphs. We find that while determining a minimum weak vertex cut can be done in polynomial time and is equivalent to finding a minimum vertex cut set in the 2-section of the hypergraph in question, determining a minimum strong vertex cut for general hypergraphs is NP-hard. We also consider some classes of hypergraphs and show that over some of these classes the problem of finding minimum strong vertex cuts remains NP-hard, while for others the problem is in P.

Key words: hypergraph; connectivity; computational complexity; transversal

AMS subject classifications: 05C65, 05C40, 68Q17

1 Introduction

When extending concepts from graph theory to the realm of hypergraphs it is not unusual for there to be multiple natural ways in which the concepts can be generalized. This is the case when considering aspects of connectivity. For

*tutte.institute+MeganDewar@gmail.com; Tutte Institute for Mathematics and Computing, Ottawa, ON, Canada

†dapike@mun.ca; Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, NL, Canada

‡tutte.institute+JohnProos@gmail.com; Tutte Institute for Mathematics and Computing, Ottawa, ON, Canada

a connected graph G, its connectivity $\kappa(G)$ is defined as the least number of vertices whose deletion from G results in a graph that is not connected. Since each edge of G is a 2-subset of the vertex set of the graph, deleting a vertex from an edge has the same effect as removing that edge from the edge set of the graph. However, for hypergraphs the removal of a vertex from each hyperedge that contains it may be quite different from removing these hyperedges in their entirety. These distinctions give rise to the notions of **weak vertex deletion** and **strong vertex deletion**, respectively. We correspondingly define the **weak connectivity** $\kappa_W(H)$ (resp., the **strong connectivity** $\kappa_S(H)$) of a hypergraph H to be the least number of vertices whose weak (resp., strong) deletion from H results in a hypergraph with more connected components than are in H.

Hypergraphs with weak connectivity $\kappa_W(H) = 1$ have recently been considered by Bahmanian and Šajna [1]. In the present paper we consider vertex cuts of any size, with emphasis on strong connectivity. Strong connectivity serves as a natural model for a number of settings. For example, in a network based upon classic token rings every node within a single token ring must be operational in order for the ring itself to be functional. If each ring were to be represented by a hyperedge then the failure of any single node would correspond to the strong deletion of that node's vertex. By representing the overall network as a hypergraph H, then $\kappa_S(H)$ denotes the smallest number of nodes whose failure would result in some pair of surviving nodes becoming unable to communicate with each other.

In 1932, Whitney established one of the basic foundations of connectivity for graphs: that the connectivity $\kappa(G)$ of a connected graph G is bounded above by the edge-connectivity $\kappa'(G)$, which in turn is bounded above by the minimum degree $\delta(G)$ of the graph G [6]. We are able to extend Whitney's result to hypergraphs. To do so, we also introduce notions of weak and strong edge deletion, for which the weak deletion of a hyperedge e merely involves removing e from the edge set of the hypergraph. By defining $\kappa'_W(H)$ to be the least number of hyperedges whose weak deletion from H results in a hypergraph having more connected components than H, we find that Whitney's result can be generalized as follows:

Theorem 1 *If $H = (V, E)$ is a connected hypergraph with at least two vertices then $\kappa_S(H) \leqslant \kappa'_W(H) \leqslant \delta(H)$, where $\delta(H)$ denotes the minimum degree of the vertices of H.*

A familiar fact about graphs is that it is a computationally straightforward task to compute the connectivity $\kappa(G)$ of any given graph G, as well as to find a corresponding vertex cut of cardinality $\kappa(G)$. More formally, these problems

are in the class P of problems that can be solved in polynomial time. We show that this is also the case for weak connectivity of hypergraphs:

Theorem 2 *Determining $\kappa_W(H)$ for a hypergraph H and finding a minimum weak cut set of H are in P.*

However, in stark contrast to graphs (for which "strong" connectivity coincides with "weak" connectivity and hence can be determined in polynomial time), for hypergraphs we show that strong connectivity is, in general, computationally intractable:

Theorem 3 *The problem of determining $\kappa_S(H)$ for a hypergraph H is NP-hard. Furthermore the problem remains NP-hard when H is restricted to hypergraphs with maximum edge size at most 3.*

We subsequently consider the complexity of calculating $\kappa_S(H)$ for various classes of hypergraphs, as well as the problem of determining the size $\tau(H)$ of a minimum transversal of a hypergraph H (which is also NP-hard when considered over the set of all hypergraphs). In spite of similarities between transversals and strong vertex cuts, we show that there exist classes of hypergraphs for which calculating one of $\kappa_S(H)$ or $\tau(H)$ is NP-hard while calculating the other parameter is in P.

2 Background terminology and notation

In this section we introduce notation and several concepts that are necessary when studying connectivity in hypergraphs. We begin with a review of basic hypergraph terminology.

2.1 Basic definitions

A **hypergraph** H, denoted $H = (V, E = (e_i)_{i\in I})$, consists of a set of **vertices** V together with a multiset $E = (e_i)_{i\in I}$ of multisets of V called **edges** (or **hyperedges**) which is indexed by an **index set** I. If V, I and all edges are finite, we call the hypergraph **finite**.

We refer to the number of vertices ($n = |V|$) as the **order** of the hypergraph and the number of edges ($m = |I|$) as the **size** of the hypergraph. A hypergraph with no edges is called **empty**. Given that E is a multiset, a hypergraph may contain repeated edges. If $e_i = e_j$, then e_i and e_j are said to be **parallel**. The number of edges parallel to e_i (including e_i) is the **multiplicity** of e_i.

If $v, w \in V$, v and w are said to be **adjacent** if there exists an edge $e_i \in E$ such that the multiset $[v, w] \subseteq e_i$ (we use square braces when listing elements of a multiset, and we use curly brackets for sets). We explicitly allow $v = w$, and use the notation $[v; t]$ to denote the multiset consisting of t copies of the element v. A vertex v and an edge e_i are said to be **incident** if $v \in e_i$. Let $E(v)$ denote the set of edges incident to vertex v. Let $m_{e_i}(v)$ denote the **multiplicity** with which v appears in edge e_i, then the **degree** of vertex v is defined as $deg(v) = \sum_{i \in I} m_{e_i}(v)$. We note that a multiset definition of edges requires terminology to distinguish between the number of vertices in an edge and the number of *distinct* vertices in an edge. Let $|e_i|$ denote the number of elements in the multiset e_i. We will refer to this as the **size** of the edge. Taking terminology from multiset theory, let $supp(e_i)$, called the **support** of e_i, denote the distinct elements of e_i, i.e., $supp(e_i) = \{v \in e_i \,|\, m_{e_i}(v) > 0\}$. The support is alternatively denoted by e_i^*. Multiset theory refers to $|supp(e_i)|$ as the **cardinality** of the multiset (edge) e_i. This terminology/notation allows us to distinguish between the two counts of edge size. A hypergraph is called **k-uniform** if $|e_i| = k$ for all $i \in I$. A hypergraph which is 2-uniform (i.e., $|e_i| = 2$, for all $i \in I$) is called a **graph** (or multigraph) and if, in addition, there are no parallel edges or loops, then it is called a **simple** graph.

2.2 Associated hypergraphs and graphs

Given a hypergraph $H = (V, E = (e_i)_{i \in I})$ we define the **support hypergraph** of H as $H_{supp} = (V, supp(F = (f_i)_{i \in I}))$ where $f_i = supp(e_i)$ for all $i \in I$. That is, the support hypergraph of H is formed by replacing each edge of H by its support set, and then taking the support set of these edges to ensure no edges are repeated. Clearly, if $supp(e_i) = e_i$ for all $i \in I$, and $supp(F) = F$, then $H_{supp} = H$.

Given a hypergraph $H = (V, E = (e_i)_{i \in I})$, the **dual hypergraph**, denoted $H' = (V', E')$, is the hypergraph with $V' = I$ and $E' = (e'_v)_{v \in V}$, where e'_v is the multiset of I with $m_{e'_v}(i) = m_{e_i}(v)$. That is, H' has a vertex for every hyperedge of H, a hyperedge for every vertex of H, and the multiplicity of i in the hyperedge corresponding to v is the multiplicity in H of v in e_i. It is perhaps easier to visualize the dualization process as creating the hypergraph whose incidence matrix is the transpose of the incidence matrix of the original. The incidence matrix of a hypergraph H is the $n \times m$ matrix, $M = (m_{ij})$, where rows are indexed by vertices, columns are indexed by edges, and $m_{ij} = m_{e_j}(v_i)$ (i.e. the multiplicity of v_i in e_j).

Given a hypergraph H, the **2-section** of H is the graph, denoted $[H]_2 = (V, E_2)$, where $\{v, w\} \in E_2$ if $v \neq w$ and there exists an edge $e_i \in E$ such

that $\{v, w\} \subseteq e_i$. The **incidence graph** of H is the graph, denoted $G(H) = (V \cup E, E')$, where $E' = \big\{\{v, e\} \,|\, v \in V, e \in E, v \in e\big\}$. Note that $G(H)$ is bipartite with bipartition (V, E). An important observation is that the incidence graph retains complete information about the hypergraph, whereas the 2-section does not.

2.3 Substructures of hypergraphs

An extensive list of hypergraph constructions appears in Bahmanian and Šajna [1]. Some, but not all, of their terminology coincides with [3], while the terminology is somewhat reversed in [5]. Here we introduce new terminology which we think more clearly represents the substructures created, while referencing the alternate naming conventions that have been employed in other presentations.

A hypergraph $H' = (V', E' = (e'_i)_{i \in I'})$ is a **weak subhypergraph** of $H = (V, E = (e_i)_{i \in I})$ if $V' \subseteq V$, $I' \subseteq I$, and for each $i \in I'$, $e'_i = [v; m_{(e_i)}(v) \,|\, v \in e_i \cap V']$. Equivalently, the incidence matrix of H', after a suitable permutation of its rows and columns is a submatrix of the incidence matrix of H. Note that a weak subhypergraph may have empty edges and/or isolated nodes. If given $H = (V, E)$ and $V' \subseteq V$, we say $H' = (V', E' = (e'_i)_{i \in I'})$ is the **weak subhypergraph (of $\mathbf{H}$) induced by $\mathbf{V'}$** where $I' = \{i \,|\, e_i \cap V' \neq \emptyset\}$ and $e'_i = [v; m_{(e_i)}(v) \,|\, v \in e_i \cap V]$. Weak subhypergraphs are called **subhypergraphs** by Bahmanian and Šajna [1], and Duchet [3].

Another class of new hypergraphs that can be obtained from other hypergraphs are **strong subhypergraphs**. These are termed **hypersubgraphs** by Bahmanian and Šajna [1], while these same hypergraphs are called **partial (sub)hypergraphs** by Duchet [3]. A **strong subhypergraph** is a consistent subfamily of vertices and edges from another hypergraph, that is, a hypergraph $H' = (V', E' = (e_i)_{i \in I'})$ is called a stong subhypergraph of $H = (V, E = (e_i)_{i \in I})$ if $V' \subseteq V$ and $E' \subseteq E$. If given $H = (V, E)$ and $V' \subseteq V$, we say $H' = (V', E')$, where $E' = \{(e_i)_{i \in I} \,|\, supp(e_i) \subseteq V', e_i \neq \emptyset\}$, is the **strong subhypergraph (of $\mathbf{H}$) induced by $\mathbf{V'}$**. Alternatively, given E' (or I'), we say $H' = (V', E')$, where $V' = \cup_{e_i \in E'} \{e_i\}$ (or $V' = \cup_{i \in I'} supp(e_i)$), is the **strong subhypergraph (of $\mathbf{H}$) induced by $\mathbf{E'}$** (or I').

A subhypergraph in which $V' = V$ is called **spanning**.

2.4 Paths and walks

Given a hypergraph $H = (V, E = (e_i)_{i \in I})$ we define a **path** in H to be an alternating sequence $v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_s, v_{s+1}$ of vertices and edges of H such that:

1. $v_j \in V$ for $j = 1, \ldots, s+1$ and the v_j are distinct with the possible exception that $v_1 = v_{s+1}$;

2. $e_j \in E$ for $j = 1, \ldots, s$ and the e_j are distinct;

3. the multiset $[v_j, v_{j+1}] \subseteq e_j$ for $j = 1, \ldots, s$.

Such a path from v_1 to v_{s+1} will be referred to as a (v_1, v_{s+1})-path. When the edges of a path are either canonical or unimportant, we shall sometimes denote a path simply as a sequence of vertices. Two vertices $v, w \in V$ are said to be in the same connected component of H if there exists a (v, w)-path in H.

As in graph theoretic terminology, a **cycle** is a path where $v_1 = v_{s+1}$ and a **walk** is a path where the restriction that the vertices and the edges be distinct is removed. That is, a walk in H is an alternating sequence $v_1, e_1, v_2, \ldots, e_s, v_{s+1}$ of vertices and edges of H such that for $j = 1, \ldots, s$ the multiset $[v_j, v_{j+1}] \subseteq e_j$. The **length** of a path, cycle or walk is the number of edges (counting multiplicity for walks) that it contains.

See [1] for a more rigorous treatment of walks, paths, cycles *and* trails in the case of hypergraphs whose edges are sets.

2.5 Vertex deletion

Given a hypergraph $H = (V, E = (e_i)_{i \in I})$ we can form new hypergraphs by deleting vertices in the following ways:

- **strong vertex deletion** of a vertex $v \in V$ creates the hypergraph $H' = (V', E' = (e_i)_{i \in I'})$ where $V' = V \setminus \{v\}$ and $I' = \{i \in I \mid v \notin e_i\}$. That is, strong deletion of v removes v and all edges that are incident to v from the hypergraph. For any subset X of V, we use $H \setminus_S X$ to denote the hypergraph formed by strongly deleting all the vertices of X from H.

- **weak vertex deletion** of a vertex $v \in V$ creates the hypergraph $H' = (V', E' = (e'_i)_{i \in I})$ where $V' = V \setminus \{v\}$ and for $i \in I$ we have $e'_i = e_i$ if $v \notin e_i$ and $e'_i = e_i \setminus [v; m_{e_i}(v)]$. That is, weak deletion of v removes v and all occurences of v from the edges of the hypergraph. For any subset X of V, we use $H \setminus_W X$ to denote the hypergraph formed by weakly deleting all the vertices of X from H.

Similarly, we define strong and weak edge deletion as follows:

- **strong edge deletion** of an edge $e_j \in E$ creates the hypergraph $H' = (V', E' = (e'_i)_{i \in I'})$ where $V' = V \setminus \{e_j\}$, $I' = I \setminus \{j\}$ and $e'_i = e_i \setminus$

$[v; m_{e_i}(v) \mid v \in e_j]$ for $i \neq j$. That is, strong edge deletion of e_j removes e_j from the hypergraph and weakly vertex deletes all the vertices incident with e_j. For any subset F of E, we use $H \setminus_S F$ to denote the hypergraph formed by strongly deleting all the edges of F from H.

- **weak edge deletion** of an edge $e_j \in E$ creates the hypergraph $H' = (V, E' = (e_i)_{i \in I'})$ where $I' = I \setminus \{j\}$. That is, weak edge deletion of e_j simply removes e_j without affecting the rest of the hypergraph. For any subset F of E, we use $H \setminus_W F$ to denote the hypergraph formed by weakly deleting all the edges of F from H.

Note that strong and weak edge deletion in a hypergraph H correspond to strong and weak vertex deletion in the dual of H. In this paper we are mainly focussed on vertex deletion, but will also discuss weak edge deletion.

3 Connectivity

We are interested in generalizing the concepts of cut vertices and cut sets to hypergraphs. The natural idea is to say that if $H = (V, E)$ is a hypergraph with k connected components then a set $S \subseteq V$ is a vertex cut set if the number of connected components that exist subsequent to the deletion of each vertex of S is greater than k. For connected hypergraphs, the cardinality of the smallest cut set is called the **vertex connectivity** of the hypergraph. However, it may be that we want to weakly delete some vertices of S and strongly delete others, and so we define three different connectivity parameters:

Definition 1 *$\kappa_W(H)$ is the least number of vertices whose weak deletion increases the number of connected components in the hypergraph H. Such sets of vertices are called* **weak vertex cuts**. *If no such set of vertices exists then we define $\kappa_W(H) = |V| - 1$.*

Definition 2 *$\kappa_M(H)$ is the least number of vertices whose deletion increases the number of connected components in the hypergraph H, where some of the vertices (possibly none of them) are weakly deleted and some of them (again possibly none) are strongly deleted. Such sets of vertices are called* **mixed vertex cuts**. *If no such set of vertices exists then we define $\kappa_M(H) = |V| - 1$.*

Definition 3 *$\kappa_S(H)$ is the least number of vertices whose strong deletion increases the number of connected components in the hypergraph H. Such sets of vertices are called* **strong vertex cuts**. *If no such set of vertices exists then we define $\kappa_S(H) = |V| - 1$.*

Note that repeated edges, repeated vertices within an edge and edges of size less than 2 have no effect on the vertex connectivity of a hypergraph. As such, unless otherwise stated, our discussion of vertex connectivity shall assume that the hypergraphs being considered have no repeated edges, no repeated vertices within an edge and no edges of size less than 2 (i.e., instead of dealing with H we can deal with $supp(H)$ with any edges of size less than 2 removed).

It follows from the definitions that $\kappa_W(H) \geqslant \kappa_M(H) \geqslant \kappa_S(H)$ because strongly deleting those vertices that were marked for weak deletion still disconnects the hypergraph. As we permit mixed cut sets to possess zero vertices that are to be weakly deleted, $\kappa_M(H) = \kappa_S(H)$ since any strong cut set would also be a valid mixed cut set. However, if we were to alter the definition and require a mixed cut set to contain at least one vertex that is to be weakly deleted and also at least one vertex that is to be strongly deleted then under this revised definition there would be hypergraphs for which $\kappa_M(H) > \kappa_S(H)$. For example let H be a path of length 4. Then $\kappa_S(H) = 1$ while $\kappa_M(H) = 2$ since we need to have vertices both weakly and strongly deleted. If we were to further make exceptions to the definition of κ_M for cut vertices then consider the hypergraph H' on vertices $\{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$ with edges $\{v_1, v_2, v_3\}, \{v_1, v_2, v_4\}, \{v_1, v_3, v_4\}$, and $\{v_2, v_3, v_4\}$. We have $\kappa_S(H') = 2$, but there are no mixed cut sets of H' that weakly delete a vertex.

In [1] Bahmanian and Šajna introduced the notion of a cut vertex as being any vertex whose deletion increases the number of components of the hypergraph. The deletion model in question is weak deletion. It is proved in their Theorem 3.29 that every cut vertex is also a separating vertex (see their Definition 3.28) and in their Theorem 3.31 that v is a separating vertex of the hypergraph H if and only if v is a cut vertex (in the traditional sense for graphs) of the bipartite incidence graph for H. Since graph connectivity is computationally easy, this provides an easy way to identify whether a connected hypergraph H has any cut vertices within the model of weak vertex deletion.

For weak and strong edge deletion we define:

Definition 4 *$\kappa'_W(H)$ is the least number of edges whose weak deletion increases the number of connected components in the hypergraph H. Such sets of edges are called* **weak edge cuts**. *If no such set of edges exists (i.e., H contains no edges) then we define $\kappa'_W(H) = \infty$.*

Definition 5 *$\kappa'_S(H)$ is the least number of edges whose strong deletion increases the number of connected components in the hypergraph H. Such sets of edges are called* **strong edge cuts**. *If no such set of edges exists then we define $\kappa'_S(H) = \infty$.*

For two vertices v_1 and v_2 in the same connected component of $H = (V, E)$ we use the notation $\kappa_S(H, v_1, v_2)$ to denote the size of the smallest set of vertices of $V \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}$ which, when strongly deleted, separates v_1 and v_2. If no such set of vertices exists then we define $\kappa_S(H, v_1, v_2) = |V| - 1$. Similarly, we define $\kappa_W(H, v_1, v_2)$, $\kappa'_W(H, v_1, v_2)$, and $\kappa'_S(H, v_1, v_2)$ with the distinction that the values of $\kappa'_W(H, v_1, v_2)$ and $\kappa'_S(H, v_1, v_2)$ are infinite when no edge cut exists.

3.1 Weak versus strong vertex connectivity

First observe that it is false that every strong cut set of order $\kappa_S(H)$ is a subset of a weak cut set of order $\kappa_W(H)$. In fact there are hypergraphs H such that if C_W and C_S are minimum weak and strong cut sets of H then $C_W \cap C_S = \emptyset$. For example, take two copies of the complete graph on four vertices: one on the vertex set $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ denoted K_{4_x}; and the other on vertex set $\{y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4\}$ and denoted K_{4_y}. Then define $H = (V, E)$ with

$$V = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4, z\}$$

and

$$E = E(K_{4_x}) \cup E(K_{4_y}) \cup \{\{x_1, y_1, z\}, \{x_2, y_2, z\}\}$$

(see Figure 1). Then $\{z\}$ is the unique minimum strong cut set of H, while the minimum weak cut sets of H are $\{x_1, x_2\}$ and $\{y_1, y_2\}$.



Figure 1: Hypergraph with disjoint minimum weak and strong cut sets

Also observe that the difference $\kappa_S(H) - \kappa_W(H)$ can be arbitrarily large. As an example, let $n \geqslant 2$ and consider the hypergraph $H = (V, E)$ where $V = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_n, z\}$ and E consists of the hyperedges $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$, $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$ and $\{x_i, y_i, z\}$ for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ (see Figure 2). Here $\kappa_S(H) = 1$ (z is the strong cut vertex) whereas $\kappa_W(H) = n + 1$ (z together with x_i or y_i for each i, where at least one x-vertex and one y-vertex is selected). Thus finding a minimum weak cut set may be a poor approximation for the problem of finding a minimum strong cut set.



Figure 2: Hypergraph with arbitrary size difference in minimum weak and strong cut sets

3.2 Bounds on minimum cuts

In 1932 Whitney [6] showed that for connected graphs the minimum size of a vertex cut is at most the minimum size of an edge cut, which in turn is at most the minimum degree of a vertex, i.e., that $\kappa(G) \leqslant \kappa'(G) \leqslant \delta(G)$ for any graph G. We begin this section by showing that this result can be generalized to hypergraphs. Note, however, that there are hypergraphs H for which $\kappa_W(H) > \kappa'_W(H)$ as well as other hypergraphs H for which $\kappa_W(H) < \kappa'_W(H)$. The generalization that we establish involves strong connectivity and weak edge-connectivity. Since both vertex degrees and weak edge cuts are affected by repeated vertices in edges, repeated edges, and edges of size one, for this section we shall revert to the assumption that we are dealing with general hypergraphs which can have any or all of these.

Lemma 1 *If $H = (V, E)$ is a connected hypergraph with at least two vertices then $\kappa'_W(H) \leqslant \delta(H)$, where $\delta(H)$ denotes the minimum degree of the vertices of H.*

Proof:
Let $v \in V$ be a vertex of degree $\delta(H)$. Let $S \subseteq E$ be the set of edges whose support is of size at least 2 (i.e., the edges of H that contain at least two distinct vertices). Then the edges of S that are incident with v form a weak edge cut of size at most $\delta(H)$. □

Theorem 1 *If $H = (V, E)$ is a connected hypergraph with at least two vertices then $\kappa_S(H) \leqslant \kappa'_W(H) \leqslant \delta(H)$, where $\delta(H)$ denotes the minimum degree of the vertices of H.*

Proof:
Lemma 1 shows that $\kappa'_W(H) \leqslant \delta(H)$. Thus it only remains to show that $\kappa_S(H) \leqslant \kappa'_W(H)$

Note that edges of size less than 2 do not affect $\kappa_S(H)$ or $\kappa'_W(H)$. Additionally, removing repeated occurrences of a vertex from within an edge (leaving one copy) does not affect $\kappa_S(H)$ or $\kappa'_W(H)$. Thus we can assume that H does not contain edges of size less than 2 or edges with repeated vertices. While not required for the proof, since repeated edges do not affect $\kappa_S(H)$ and cannot decrease $\kappa'_W(H)$, we could also assume that H does not contain repeated edges.

Let $H = (V, E)$ be a connected hypergraph with at least two vertices and let F be a minimum weak edge cut of H. As $\kappa_S(H) \leqslant |V| - 1$ by definition, if $|F| \geqslant |V|-1$ then the result holds. Thus we shall now assume that $|F| < |V|-1$. The result will follow by showing that we can find a strong vertex cut of size at most $|F|$.

As F is a weak edge cut, the hypergraph $H \setminus_W F$ is disconnected. Let $H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_k$ be the connected components of $H \setminus_W F$. Furthermore, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, k$, let V_i be the vertices of H_i (note that $\cup_{i=1}^{k} V_i = V$) and let W_i be the vertices of V_i that are incident to at least one edge in F.

By the minimality of F we know that every edge of F intersects every W_i. This implies that for each i there exists a set $Z_i \subseteq W_i$ such that $|Z_i| \leqslant |F|$ and Z_i intersects every edge of F. The sets Z_i can be found by a simple greedy approach. Start with $Z_i = \emptyset$ and while there exists an edge $f \in F$ that does not intersect Z_i select any vertex in $f \cap W_i$ and add it to Z_i.

Suppose that $k \geqslant 3$. Then strongly deleting the vertices of Z_3 will delete all the edges of F and separate the vertices in V_1 from those in V_2. Therefore when $k \geqslant 3$ there exists a strong vertex cut of size at most $|F|$ and so we shall now assume that $k = 2$.

Suppose that there exists a vertex $v \in V_1 \setminus Z_1$. Then Z_1 is a strong vertex cut that separates v from V_2 and we again have a strong vertex cut of size at most $|F|$. Similarly, such a strong vertex cut also exists if there is a vertex $v \in V_2 \setminus Z_2$. Thus we shall now assume that $V_1 = W_1 = Z_1$ and $V_2 = W_2 = Z_2$.

Suppose that there exists a pair of vertices $v_1 \in V_1$ and $v_2 \in V_2$ such that F does not contain an edge of size two consisting of exactly these two vertices. Then we can greedily find a set $Z \subseteq (V_1 \setminus \{v_1\}) \cup (V_2 \setminus \{v_2\}) = V \setminus \{v_1, v_2\}$ of size at most $|F|$ that intersects every edge of F. Simply start with $Z = \emptyset$ and while there exists an edge $f \in F$ that does not intersect Z select any vertex in $f \cap (V \setminus \{v_1, v_2\})$ and add it to Z (which is always possible since $|f| \geqslant 2$ and $f \neq \{v_1, v_2\}$). Strongly deleting the vertices of Z will delete all the edges of F and thus separate v_1 and v_2. Therefore, if such vertices v_1 and v_2 exist then we

have a strong vertex cut of size at most $|F|$. Thus we shall now assume that F contains an edge of size two for all pairs of vertices $v_1 \in V_1$ and $v_2 \in V_2$.

We now have that $|V| = |V_1| + |V_2|$ and that F contains at least $|V_1| \cdot |V_2|$ edges. Since the $|V_i|$ are positive integers, we have that $|V| - 1 = |V_1| + |V_2| - 1 \leqslant |V_1| \cdot |V_2| \leqslant |F|$. However, this would contradict the assumption that $|F| < |V| - 1$ and so the result holds.□

3.2.1 Transversals versus strong vertex cuts

A **transversal** of a hypergraph H is a set T of vertices such that T has nonempty intersection with every nonempty edge of H. The size of a smallest transversal of a hypergraph H is called the **transversal number** of H and is denoted as $\tau(H)$ (for more details on transversals see [3]). Thought of another way, a transversal is a set of vertices whose strong deletion separates all of the remaining vertices from each other (possibly vacuously, if there are zero remaining vertices).

This second way of thinking about transversals shows a similarity between transversals and strong vertex cuts, namely that they both involve strongly deleting a set of vertices to create separations between the vertices that remain. Consider a connected hypergraph $H = (V, E)$ and let V_τ and V_{κ_S} be a minimum transversal and a minimum strong vertex cut of H, respectively. Then V_τ is a smallest set of vertices whose strong deletion separates *all* (possibly zero) pairs of remaining vertices, while V_{κ_S} is a smallest set of vertices whose strong deletion separates at least *one* pair of remaining vertices. Thus any transversal of H of size at most $|V| - 2$ is also a strong vertex cut of H. Combining this with the facts that $\kappa_S(H) \leqslant |V| - 1$ by definition and that $\tau(H)$ is defined for any H (V is always a transversal) and we have proved the following lemma.

Lemma 2 *If $H = (V, E)$ is a connected hypergraph then $\kappa_S(H) \leqslant \tau(H)$.*

It is interesting to observe that finding minimum transversals can be used to calculate strong connectivity. Given two vertices u and v in a hypergraph H, let $H'_{u,v}$ denote the hypergraph such that $V(H'_{u,v}) = V(H) \setminus \{u, v\}$ and $E(H'_{u,v})$ consists of the support set for each (u, v)-path in H (but with vertices u and v omitted). Note that $\kappa_S(H) = \min_{u,v \in V}\{\kappa_S(H, u, v)\}$, and that $\kappa_S(H, u, v)$ is equal to the size of a minimum transversal in $H'_{u,v}$. However, to rely upon this observation as a means of computing $\kappa_S(H)$ would require finding the support of all (u, v)-paths in H, which may not be practical.

Later in this paper we will consider the complexity of calculating $\kappa_S(H)$ for various classes of hypergraphs. As we shall see, although there are similarities between transversals and strong vertex cuts, there exist classes of hypergraphs

for which calculating $\tau(H)$ is NP-hard while calculating $\kappa_S(H)$ is in P, and there exist other classes of hypergraphs for which calculating $\tau(H)$ is in P while calculating $\kappa_S(H)$ is NP-hard (see Section 3.5).

3.3 Complexity of weak vertex connectivity

In [1] Bahmanian and Šajna showed that weak cut vertices of hypergraphs can be found by looking for cut vertices in their incidence graphs. Thus finding weak cut vertices is in P. We shall now show that finding minimum weak vertex cut sets is also in P.

Lemma 3 *Let $H = (V, E)$ be a hypergraph, let $u, v \in V$ and let $[H]_2$ be the 2-section graph of H. The vertices u and v are connected in H if and only if they are connected in $[H]_2$.*

Proof:
Let $u = v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_k = v$ be a (u, v)-path in H. Then there exist edges in H containing the pairs $\{v_i, v_{i+1}\}$ for $i = 0, \ldots, k-1$. Therefore $u = v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_k = v$ is also a (u, v)-path in $[H]_2$.

Conversely suppose that $u = v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_k = v$ is a (u, v)-path in $[H]_2$. Then there exist hyperedges in H containing $\{v_i, v_{i+1}\}$ for $i = 0, \ldots, k-1$. Therefore $u = v_0, v_1, \ldots, v_k = v$ is a (u, v)-walk in H (it may contain repeated edges and thus may not be a path).□

Lemma 4 *The weak vertex cut sets of a hypergraph H correspond exactly to the (graph) cut sets of its 2-section $[H]_2$. $\kappa_W(H)$ is equal to the connectivity of $[H]_2$.*

Proof:
Let $H = (V, E)$ be a hypergraph and let $[H]_2$ be the 2-section graph of H. Lemma 3 shows that the number of connected components of H and $[H]_2$ are equal. Furthermore, the lemma shows that if $S \subset V$ then $H \setminus_W S$ has the same number of components as the 2-section of $H \setminus_W S$. The result then follows from the fact that the 2-section of $H \setminus_W S$ is exactly $[H]_2 \setminus S$ (where for $[H]_2 \setminus S$ the vertices are deleted from $[H]_2$ in the usual graph theoretic sense; i.e., strong hypergraph vertex deletion).□

Theorem 2 *Determining $\kappa_W(H)$ for a hypergraph H and finding a minimum weak cut set of H are in P.*

Proof: Recall that finding minimum cut sets in graphs is in P (e.g., by using max flow - min cut techniques; see [2].) The theorem holds by combining this fact with Lemma 4.□

The 2-section of a hypergraph H can have a much larger edge count than H which could affect the efficiency of finding minimum weak cut sets in practice. However, the problem of finding a minimum weak cut set of a hypergraph $H = (V, E)$ in polynomial time can be solved without resorting to the 2-section of H by reducing the problem to finding minimum capacity cuts in $\binom{|V|}{2}$ weighted directed acyclic graphs (DAGs).

Suppose that $V = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n\}$ and $E = \{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_m\}$. Then

$$\kappa_W(H) = \min_{i,j \in \{1,2,\ldots,n\}, i<j} \{\kappa_W(H, v_i, v_j)\}$$

and thus $\kappa_W(H)$ can be reduced to determining $\kappa_W(H, v_i, v_j)$ for all $\binom{|V|}{2}$ pairs of vertices (v_i, v_j). We shall now turn our attention to a polynomial time algorithm for finding $\kappa_W(H, v_i, v_j)$ based on finding minimum capacity cuts in a DAG. Without loss of generality we shall describe the algorithm for $i = 1$ and $j = n > 2$ (if $n = 2$ then there are no weak (v_1, v_2)-cut sets).

Begin by forming the DAG $G = (V_G, E_G)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} V_G &= \{v_{1,out}, v_{2,in}, v_{2,out}, v_{3,in}, v_{3,out}, \ldots, v_{n-1,in}, v_{n-1,out}, v_{n,in}\} \cup E; \text{ and} \\ E_G &= \{(v_{i,out}, e) \,|\, e \in E, v_i \in e, i \neq n\} \cup \{(e, v_{i,in}) \,|\, e \in E, v_i \in e, i \neq 1\} \cup \\ &\quad \{(v_{i,in}, v_{i,out}) \,|\, i \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n-1\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

This formation of the DAG G from H can be thought of as follows: start with the incidence graph of H; for each vertex v corresponding to a hypergraph vertex, replace v with two vertices v_{in} and v_{out}, and a directed edge from v_{in} to v_{out}; replace each edge $\{v, e\}$ in the incidence graph with the two directed edges (e, v_{in}) and (v_{out}, e); and lastly remove $v_{1,in}$ and $v_{n,out}$.

Put a capacity of 1 on all edges of the form $(v_{i,in}, v_{i,out})$ and an infinite capacity on all other edges of G. Standard max flow-min cut algorithms can then be used to find a minimum capacity $(v_{1,out}, v_{n,in})$-cut in G in polynomial time. (e.g., the augmenting path algorithm; see [2] page 42.)

Let $\sigma(C_G)$ be a minimum capacity $(v_{1,out}, v_{n,in})$-cut of G (where for a set of vertices S we use $\sigma(S)$ to denote the set of edges with tails in S and heads not in S; we use σ instead of the usual δ since we have previously used δ for minimum degree). The following lemma implies that C_G either yields a minimum weak (v_1, v_n)-cut in H or shows that $\kappa_W(H, v_1, v_n) = |V(H)| - 1$.

Lemma 5 *If the capacity of $\sigma(C_G)$ is finite then the capacity is $\kappa_W(H, v_1, v_n)$. If the capacity of $\sigma(C_G)$ is infinite then $\kappa_W(H, v_1, v_n) = |V(H)| - 1$. Futher-*

more when $\kappa_W(H, v_1, v_n) = k < |V(H)| - 1$ *the set* $C_H = \{v_i \,|\, v_{i,in} \in C_G, v_{i,out} \notin C_G\}$ *is a minimum weak* (v_1, v_n)*-vertex cut in* H*.*

Proof:
If the capacity of $\sigma(C_G)$ is infinite then there exists an edge in H which contains both v_1 and v_n (otherwise $C = \{v_{i,in} \,|\, 2 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1\}$ is a $(v_{1,out}, v_{n,in})$-cut of finite capacity $n-2$). In this case v_1 and v_n cannot be separated in H by a weak vertex cut and $\kappa_W(H, v_1, v_n) = |V(H)| - 1$.

Suppose that the capacity of $\sigma(C_G)$ is $k < \infty$. By the construction of G, there must be exactly k indices in $\{2, \ldots, n-1\}$ such that $v_{i,in} \in C_G$ and $v_{i,out} \notin C_G$ (each such i yielding a single edge of capacity 1 in $\sigma(C_G)$). Let I be the set of such indices and let $C_H = \{v_i \,|\, i \in I\}$.

By construction $|C_H| = k$ and we will now show that C_H is a weak (v_1, v_n)-cut in H. Suppose that

$$P_H = v_1, e_{p_1}, v_{p_1}, e_{p_2}, v_{p_2}, \ldots, e_{p_b}, v_{p_b} = v_n$$

is a (v_1, v_n)-path in $H \setminus_W C_H$. Then P_H corresponds to the path

$$P_G = v_{1,out}, e_{p_1}, v_{p_1,in}, v_{p_1,out}, e_{p_2}, v_{p_2,in}, v_{p_2,out}, \ldots, e_{p_b}, v_{p_b,in} = v_{n,in}$$

in G (note that the e_{p_j} are edges of P_H, but vertices of P_G). As $\sigma(C_G)$ is a $(v_{1,out}, v_{n,in})$-cut, the path P_G must contain at least one edge of the cut. Let f be such an edge. As C_G is a finite capacity cut, f must be one of the $(v_{p_j,in}, v_{p_j,out})$ edges. However, this contradicts the fact that P_H is a path in $H \setminus_W C_H$. Therefore C_H is a weak (v_1, v_n)-cut in H of size equal to the capacity of C_G.

Now suppose $C_H \subset V$ is a minimal weak (v_1, v_n)-cut of H of finite size k. Let $F = \{(v_{i,in}, v_{i,out}) \,|\, v_i \in C_H\} \subset E_G$ and consider $G \setminus F$. Any $(v_{1,out}, v_{n,in})$-path in $G \setminus F$ must be of the form

$$P_G = v_{1,out}, e_{p_1}, v_{p_1,in}, v_{p_1,out}, e_{p_2}, v_{p_2,in}, v_{p_2,out}, \ldots, e_{p_b}, v_{p_b,in} = v_{n,in}$$

and corresponds to the (v_1, v_n)-path

$$P_H = v_1, e_{p_1}, v_{p_1}, e_{p_2}, v_{p_2}, \ldots, e_{p_b}, v_{p_b} = v_n$$

in $H \setminus_W C_H$. As there are no (v_1, v_n)-paths in $H \setminus_W C_H$, there can be no such $(v_{1,out}, v_{n,in})$-path in $G \setminus F$ and we have that F separates $v_{1,out}$ and $v_{n,in}$. Let

$$C_G = \{v \in V(G) \,|\, \exists \text{ a } (v_{1,out}, v)\text{-path in } G \setminus F\}.$$

As $v_{n,in} \notin C_G$, it follows that $\sigma(C_G)$ is a $(v_{1,out}, v_{n,in})$-cut in G. By construction, $\sigma(C_G) \subset F$ and from the minimality of C_H it follows that $\sigma(C_G) = F$. Thus minimal weak (v_1, v_n)-cuts of H of size k correspond to $(v_{1,out}, v_{n,in})$-cuts of G of capacity k and the lemma holds. □

When creating G from H the vertices $\{v_2, \ldots, v_{n-1}\}$ of H were split into in and out vertices. Suppose that instead of splitting those vertices of H we split the edges of H into in and out vertices in G and again put capacities of 1 on all (in, out) edges of G. Now the minimum capacity (v_1, v_n)-cuts of G will correspond to minimum weak (v_1, v_n)-edge cuts of H. And thus the same technique can be used to find minimum weak edge cuts of H.

3.4 Complexity of strong vertex connectivity

Lemma 6 *For hypergraphs with maximum edge size at most 2 determining $\kappa_S(H)$ and finding a minimum strong vertex cut set are in P.*

Proof:
For hypergraphs of maximum edge size at most 2, the only difference between weakly and strongly deleting a set of vertices is the potential for edges of size less than 2. However, edges of size less than 2 have no effect on the connectivity of a hypergraph. Thus for these hypergraphs the strong cut sets are exactly the weak cut sets and the result follows from Theorem 2.□

Theorem 3 *The problem of determining $\kappa_S(H)$ for a hypergraph H is NP-hard. Furthermore the problem remains NP-hard when H is restricted to hypergraphs with maximum edge size at most 3.*

Proof:
The problem of finding the size of a minimum vertex cover in a simple graph is well known to be NP-hard [4]. To show that determining $\kappa_S(H)$ for hypergraphs is NP-hard, we will reduce the NP-hard problem of finding the size of minimum vertex covers in simple graphs to the problem of finding $\kappa_S(H)$ for a hypergraph with maximum edge size of 3.

Let $G = (V_G, E_G)$ be a simple graph with $V_G = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$ and at least one edge. Note that $V_G \setminus \{x_1\}$ is a vertex cover of G (it clearly intersects each edge in E_G) and therefore the size of a minimum vertex cover of G is at most $n - 1$.

From G form the hypergraph $H = (V, E)$ where

$$\begin{aligned} A_u &= \{u_1, \ldots, u_n\} \\ A_v &= \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\} \\ V &= V_G \cup A_u \cup A_v \\ E &= \{(u_i, x_j) \,|\, 1 \leqslant i, j \leqslant n\} \cup \{e \cup \{v_i\} \,|\, e \in E_G, 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n\} \end{aligned}$$

and A_u, A_v, V_G are pairwise disjoint. Given an edge e in G we shall denote the corresponding edge $e \cup \{v_i\}$ in H by e_{v_i}. Note that it follows from G containing at least one edge that H is connected.

We now make the following four claims regarding vertex covers of G, strong cuts in H, and the relationships between them.

Claim 1: Vertex covers of G are exactly the strong (A_u, A_v)-cut sets in H.

Claim 2: If C is a minimum strong cut of H then $C \cap A_v = \emptyset$.

Claim 3: If C is a minimum strong cut of H then $C \cap A_u = \emptyset$.

Claim 4: If C is a minimum strong cut of H then C separates A_u and A_v (i.e., C is a minimum strong (A_u, A_v)-cut set in H).

Claims 2 and 3 will be used in the proof of Claim 4, while the reduction of vertex covers in simple graphs to strong cut sets in hypergraphs of maximum edge size of 3 will follow directly from the construction of H from G and Claims 1 and 4. Therefore Theorem 3 holds subject to validating the four claims.

Proof of Claim 1:
Suppose that C is a strong (A_u, A_v)-cut of H. Then $C \subset V_G$ and there exist no (u_i, v_j)-paths in $H \setminus_S C$. If $e = (x_k, x_\ell)$ is an edge of G then $u_i, \{u_i, x_k\}, x_k, e_{v_j}, v_j$ is a (u_i, v_j)-path in H. Since C is a strong A_u, A_v cut of H, this path does not exist in $H \setminus_S C$. As $u_i, v_j \notin C$, the only way for this path not to exist in $H \setminus_S C$ is if $\{x_k, x_\ell\} \cap C \neq \emptyset$. Therefore C is a vertex cover of G.

Suppose that $C \subset V_G$ is a vertex cover of G. Then C intersects all edges of G which implies that the degree of every v_j in $H \setminus_S C$ is zero. Therefore C is a strong (A_u, A_v)-cut set in H and Claim 1 holds.

Proof of Claim 2:
Let C be a minimum strong cut of H and suppose that $C \cap A_v \neq \emptyset$. Without

loss of generality we may assume that $v_1 \in C$.

By the minimality of C we know that $C' = C \setminus v_1$ is not a strong cut set of H and that v_1 is a strong cut vertex of $H' = H \setminus_S C'$. This implies that there exist two vertices w, z in H' that are adjacent to v_1 in H' but separated from each other in $H \setminus_S C$ (Consider a path in H' between vertices that are separated in $H \setminus_S C = H' \setminus v_1$. Either an edge of the path contains v_1 or v_1 is an internal vertex of the path. Both of these cases lead to such a w, z pair.)

Suppose that $\{v_1, w, z\}$ is an edge of H'. Then $\{v_j, w, z\}$ would be an edge of $H \setminus_S C$ for all $v_j \notin C$. This would contradict w and z being separated in $H \setminus_S C$ unless all the $v_j \in C$; however, that would contradict the fact that C is a minimum cut (recall that $V_G \setminus \{x_1\}$ is a strong cut of H of size $n-1$).

If there is no edge $\{v_1, w, z\}$ in H' then the construction of H implies that there exist two edges $\{v_1, w, y_w\}$ and $\{v_1, z, y_z\}$ in H'. But then

$$P = w, \{v_j, w, y_w\}, v_j, \{v_j, z, y_z\}, z$$

would be a (w, z)-path in $H \setminus_S C$ for any $v_j \notin C$. This would again imply that all the v_j are in C which would contradict the minimality of C. We can thus conclude that $C \cap A_v = \emptyset$ and Claim 2 holds.

Proof of Claim 3:
We proceed in a similar way to the proof of Claim 2.

Let C be minimum strong cut of H and suppose that $C \cap A_u \neq \emptyset$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $u_1 \in C$.

By the minimality of C we know that $C' = C \setminus u_1$ is not a strong cut set of H and that u_1 is a strong cut vertex of $H' = H \setminus_S C'$. This implies that there exist two vertices w, z in H' that are adjacent to u_1 in H' but separated from each other in $H \setminus_S C$. As the u_i are only adjacent to x_i in H, we have that $w, z \in V_G$. As all possible u_i, x_j edges appear in H, the only way for two vertices of $V_G \setminus C$ to not be connected in $H \setminus_S C$ is if all the u_i are in C which would contradict the minimality of C. Therefore $C \cap A_u = \emptyset$ and Claim 3 holds.

Proof of Claim 4:
Let C be a minimum strong cut of H. Claims 2 and 3 imply that $C \subset V_G$ and thus it only remains to show that there are no (u_i, v_j)-paths in $H \setminus_S C$.

Since C is minimal, $|C| \leqslant n-1$ and thus there exists an $x_j \notin C$. With all possible u_i, x_j edges appearing in H this implies the vertices of $A_u \cup (V_G \setminus C)$ are all in the same connected component of $H \setminus_S C$.

Suppose there exists a j such that v_j is in the same connected component of $H \setminus_S C$ as the $A_u \cup (V_G \setminus C)$ vertices. Then there exists a (u_1, v_j)-path in $H \setminus_S C$. Let e_{v_j} be the last edge in such a path and let $z \in e_{v_j} \setminus \{v_j\} \subset V_G \setminus C$.

Since $e_{v_j} \in H \setminus_S C$ and $C \cap A_v = \emptyset$ we have that e_{v_k} is in $H \setminus_S C$ for all $1 \leqslant k \leqslant n$. But then $v_j, e_{v_j}, z, e_{v_k}, v_k$ is a (v_j, v_k)-path in $H \setminus_S C$ for all $k \neq j$. This implies that all the v_k are in the same connected component of $H \setminus_S C$ as v_j which would contradict the fact that $H \setminus_S C$ is disconnected. Therefore no v_j is in the same component of $H \setminus_S C$ as the $A_u \cup (V_G \setminus C)$ vertices and Claim 4 holds.

The construction of H from G with Claims 1 and 4 shows a polynomial reduction of the problem of finding vertex covers in simple graphs to the problem of finding minimum size strong cuts in hypergraphs with maximum edge size at most 3.□

Consider the possible hypergraphs H that can be constructed from graphs G in the proof of Theorem 3. Every edge of H has one vertex in $A_u \cup A_v$ and at least one vertex in V_G. Therefore partitioning the H vertices in this way always yields a 2-colouring of H and we have that H is **bicolourable** (the requirement for hypergraph colourings is that no edge of size at least 2 is monochrome). Furthermore, as every edge of H intersects V_G the size of the minimum transversal of H is at most $|V_G| = n$. As $\{(u_i, x_i) \,|\, 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n\}$ is a matching of size n in H, we have that the maximum size of a matching equals the minimum size of a transversal for all H (i.e., H has the **König property**). Thus we have the following two corollaries.

Corollary 1 *The problem of determining $\kappa_S(H)$ for bicolourable hypergraphs H is NP-hard.*

Corollary 2 *The problem of determining $\kappa_S(H)$ for hypergraphs H with the König property is NP-hard.*

Determining $\kappa_S(H)$ for general hypergraphs (or bicolourable hypergraphs, or hypergraphs with either the König property or maximum edge size at most 3) is NP-hard; however, Lemma 6 shows an infinite class of hypergraphs (maximum edge size at most 2, which includes graphs) for which the problem is in P. Below we show other classes of hypergraphs for which the problem is in P.

Recall that a hypergraph $H = (V, E)$ is **arboreal** if there exists a tree T (not necessarily unique) on the same vertex set as H such that each edge of H induces a connected subgraph (i.e., subtree) of T. Such a tree T is called a **representative tree** of H.

Lemma 7 *For arboreal hypergraphs the problems of determining $\kappa_S(H)$ and finding a minimum strong vertex cut set when $\kappa_S(H) < |V(H)| - 1$ are in P.*

Proof:
Suppose that $H = (V, E)$ is arboreal and that $T = (V, F)$ is a representative tree of H.

Let P be a path in H and let $s(P) \subset V$ be the union of all the edges of P (called the support of P). Since each edge of P inducing a subtree of T and the edges of the path overlap, we have that $s(P)$ induces a subtree of T. It thus follows that connected components of H induce subtrees of T.

Therefore connected components of arboreal hypergraphs are also arboreal. Combining this with the fact that any minimum cut of a hypergraph is a minimum cut of one of its components, we can assume without loss of generality that H is connected.

If $|V| \leqslant 2$ then H has no strong (or weak) cut sets and $\kappa_S(H) = |V| - 1$.

Suppose that $|V| \geqslant 3$. Then T has a non-leaf vertex. Let u be a non-leaf vertex of T.

Claim: The vertex u is a cut vertex of H and $\kappa_S(H) = 1$.

Proof of claim: Since u is not a leaf, $T \setminus u$ is disconnected. Let v_1 and v_2 be vertices in different connected components of $T \setminus u$. Suppose that there exists a path P from v_1 to v_2 in $H \setminus_S u$. Then P would contain an edge e in $H \setminus_S u$ that contains vertices from two different components of $T \setminus_S u$. However, since $u \notin e$ this would mean that e does not induce a connected subgraph of T and hence contradicts the fact that H was arboreal. Therefore u is a cut vertex, $\kappa_S(H) = 1$ and the claim is true.

To determine $\kappa_S(H)$ we can simply find a connected component of H with at least three vertices or determine that no such component exists. This can be done by looping over the vertices and determining if there exists a vertex v with at least two neighbours. If no such v exists then $\kappa_S(H) = |V| - 1$. Given such a v the subtree of T induced by v and its neighbours contains non-leaf vertices all of which are cut vertices and $\kappa_S(H) = 1$. If no representative tree T is known then simply test each vertex one a time until a cut vertex is found. Trivially if H contains an edge f of size at least three then v can be taken to be any non-leaf vertex of T in f. □

Corollary 3 *The problems of determining $\kappa_S(H)$ and finding a minimum strong vertex cut set when $\kappa_S(H) < |V(H)| - 1$ are in P for hypergraphs which are:*

1. *totally balanced (i.e., all cycles of length $\geqslant 3$ have an edge that contains at least 3 vertices of the cycle);*
2. *without cycles of length $\geqslant 3$; or*
3. *interval hypergraphs (there exists a total ordering of the vertices such that all edges are intervals of the ordering).*

Proof:
Recall that interval hypergraphs and hypergraphs without cycles are totally balanced, and that totally balanced hypergraphs are arboreal (see [3] page 395). Thus the result follows directly from Lemma 7.□

Recall (see [3] page 395) that a hypergraph being arboreal implies that it is **normal** (all strong subhypergraphs have the König property) which in turn implies that it is both bicolourable and has the König property. We have already seen that finding minimum strong cut sets for arboreal hypergraphs is in P, while for the latter two classes of hypergraphs it is NP-hard. An interesting question, for which we do not yet have an answer, is the complexity of this problem for normal hypergraphs. Note that the construction used in the proof of Theorem 3 does not produce a normal hypergraph unless G contains no edges, since normal implies the Helly property (pairwise intersecting sets of edges share a common vertex), but if $(x_1, x_2) \in G$ then $\{(u_1, x_1), (u_1, x_2), (v_1, x_1, x_2)\}$ is a pairwise intersecting set of edges in H with no common vertex.

3.5 Complexity of finding strong vertex cuts versus transversals

The similarities of transversals and strong vertex cuts were discussed in Section 3.2.1 and it was shown that $\kappa_S(H) \leqslant \tau(H)$ for connected hypergraphs. We shall now consider the relative complexities of finding minimum transversals and minimum strong vertex cuts in hypergraphs.

Finding a minimum transversal of a hypergraph is an NP-hard problem (it is equivalent to the Set Covering problem of [4]). Theorem 3 showed that finding a minimum strong vertex cut in a hypergraph is also NP-hard. Given the similarity of the two problems and their complexity over the set of all hypergraphs, it is natural to wonder if there is a relationship between their complexities over various classes of hypergraphs. For example, over which classes of hypergraphs do the two problems have the same complexity, over which classes do they differ and when they differ is one problem consistently harder than the other?

Consider the class of hypergraphs with the König property. We have seen in Corollary 2 that finding minimum strong vertex cuts for hypergraphs with the König property is NP-hard. As the maximum size of a matching equals the minimum size of a transversal for hypergraphs with the König property and these problems can be formulated as dual integer linear programming problems (see [3]), the problem of finding a minimum transversal (or a maximum matching) for hypergraphs with the König property is in P. So here we have a class of hypergraphs for which calculating $\tau(H)$ is in P, but calculating $\kappa_S(H)$ is NP-hard.

As being an arboreal hypergraph implies having the König property, calcu-

lating $\tau(H)$ for arboreal hypergraphs is also in P. Combining this with Lemma 7 we see that for the class of arboreal hypergraphs calculating both $\tau(H)$ and $\kappa_S(H)$ are in P.

If $H = (V, E)$ is a hypergraph then define $f(H)$ to be the hypergraph with vertex set $V \cup \{u_1, u_2\}$ and edge set $E \cup \{\{u_1, u_2\}, \{u_1, u_2\} \cup V\}$, where $u_1 \neq u_2$ and $u_1, u_2 \notin V$. Let $\mathfrak{H} = \{f(H) \,|\, H \text{ is a hypergraph}\}$. For any hypergraph H with at least one vertex, $\{u_1\}$ is a minimum strong vertex cut of $f(H)$ and $\tau(f(H)) = \tau(H) + 1$ (the minimum transversals of $f(H)$ are exactly the minimum transversals of H with u_1 or u_2 added). Therefore over $\mathfrak{H}$ the problem of finding a minimum strong vertex cut is in P, while the problem of finding a minimum transversal is NP-hard. Thus $\mathfrak{H}$ is a class of hypergraphs for which calculating $\tau(H)$ is NP-hard, but calculating $\kappa_S(H)$ is in P.

We have now seen that there are classes of hypergraphs for which the complexities of calculating $\tau(H)$ and $\kappa_S(H)$ take on all possible combinations of being in P and being NP-hard. Determining other classes of hypergraphs for which calculating $\tau(H)$ and $\kappa_S(H)$ are of different complexity would be of interest.

4 Acknowledgements

D. Pike acknowledges research support from NSERC (grant number RGPIN-2016-04456).

References

[1] M. Amin Bahmanian and Mateja Šajna. Connection and separation in hypergraphs. *Theory and Applications of Graphs*, 2(2):0–24, 2015.

[2] William J. Cook, William H. Cunningham, William R. Pulleyblank, and Alexander Schrijver. *Combinatorial Optimization*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1998.

[3] Pierre Duchet. Hypergraphs. In R. L. Graham, M. Grötschel, and L. Lovász, editors, *Handbook of Combinatorics*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1995.

[4] Richard M. Karp. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In R. E. Miller and J. W. Thatcher, editors, *Complexity of Computer Computations*, pages 85–103. Plenum Press, New York, 1972.

[5] Vitaly I. Voloshin. *Introduction to Graph and Hypergraph Theory*. Nova Science Publishers, Inc, New York, 2009.

[6] Hassler Whitney. Congruent graphs and the connectivity of graphs. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 54:150–168, 1932.